

# **Attachment 1a**

GPAC Draft Minutes of November 5, 2025

INTENTIONALLY BLANK PAGE

CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH  
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA  
CIVIC CENTER COMMUNITY ROOM – 100 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE

November 5, 2025  
REGULAR MEETING – 4:00 P.M.

**I. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER**

General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) Co-Chair Evans called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

**II. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL**

Co-Chair Evans conducted roll call:

Present: Nicholas Acevedo, Virginia Anders-Ellmore, Dennis Baker, Curtis Black, James Carlson, Susan DeSantis, Jeremy Evans, Rita Goldberg, David Guder, Lynn Hackman, Anthony Maniscalchi, Thomas Meng, Jim Mosher, Amber Snider, Debbie Stevens, Christy Walker, and Paul Watkins

Staff: Planning Manager Ben Zdeba

Excused Absent: Annie Clougherty, Chuck Ebner, Arlene Greer, Laird Hayes, Ruth Kobayashi, Scott Laidlaw, and Katie Love

Absent: None

**III. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

(This item includes written correspondence received that is not related to items on the agenda.)

None.

**IV. CURRENT BUSINESS**

**a. Meeting Minutes of September 16, 2025 (Attachment 1 – Draft Minutes)**

*Recommended Action:*

Review and approve the minutes of September 16, 2025.

**Motion** made by GPAC Member Paul Watkins and seconded by GPAC Member Susan DeSantis to approve the meeting minutes of September 16, 2025, with GPAC Member Jim Mosher's edits.

**The motion carried unanimously. GPAC Member Dennis Baker abstained, as he did not attend the September 16, 2025, meeting.**

**b. Draft Noise Element (Attachment 2a – Draft Element; and Attachment 2b – Additional Policies)**

Despite delayed consultant support, the GPAC Noise Subcommittee has been working hard alongside Dudek and City staff to refresh and modernize the Noise Element. Since the September GPAC meeting, the Subcommittee met on October 21, 2025, to review and provide guidance on a draft of the refreshed Element. At the conclusion of the Subcommittee meeting, those in attendance agreed to allow City staff to work with Dudek to make responsive revisions and to share the Element with the full GPAC for consideration and continued discussion. Attachment 2a is the draft Element, as reviewed and revised to address input by the Subcommittee. Subcommittee Chair Mosher will provide an overview of the Subcommittee's discussions. Additionally, he has asked to include additional policies for the GPAC's discussion and consideration. Those are included as Attachment 2b.

*Recommended Actions:*

- (1) Receive an overview from the GPAC Noise Subcommittee;
- (2) Provide any feedback on the Subcommittee's efforts; and
- (3) Conduct a vote to support moving the draft Element (Attachment 2a) forward for the GPUSC's review, and for public review thereafter. The motion should include consideration for the additional policies provided as Attachment 2b.

Planning Manager Ben Zdeba noted that the Noise Subcommittee has been active, meeting nine times, but only five of them included support from Dudek. He reported that the current Noise Element was updated by the City Council in 2023 as part of the Housing Element implementation, making this process more of a refresh of a recently amended Element as opposed to a complete overhaul like with the other elements.

Consultant Elizabeth Dickson (Dudek) added that the Noise Element is also more of a refresh because it was not included in the City's Phase 1 community engagement efforts. She noted that Dudek's acoustician performed an early analysis of the Noise Element, which guided much of the Subcommittee's work, recommending updating new noise sources and maps, along with making changes to the text for clarity and consistency.

Consultant Dickson presented a map of Newport Beach's traffic noise contours along with a projected contour map based on the Housing Element's full anticipated buildout. She reported that the noise contours for John Wayne Airport are based on the 2014 Settlement Agreement Environmental Impact Report, adding that it is referenced in many Draft Policies.

Consultant Dickson reviewed the refreshed goals of the Draft Noise Element, featuring minor changes from the currently adopted goals except for an expansion to Goal N-3 to add a proactive response for emerging transportation technologies such as drones and air taxis. She reported on seven policies in the draft that are new from the current Noise Element – Draft Policy Nos. N-3.11-13, N-4.8, and N-5.2-4.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported that Noise Subcommittee Chair Mosher wishes to discuss language for additional policies based on language found in the City of Long Beach's lengthy Noise Element.

GPAC Member Mosher clarified that the Subcommittee was working towards the goal of a comprehensive update before receiving consultant assistance with a summertime pivot to a refresh. He recommended keeping the structure of the recently updated current Noise

Element, only adding policies as opposed to changing or eliminating them like other element updates.

GPAC Member Mosher reported that refreshed goals include a focus on compatibility in land use decisions. He noted how the Draft Noise Element also includes a goal, citing examples of how the City should respond to noise from land and water vehicles, aviation noise, non-transportation noise, and construction noise. He noted how Dudek interwove the narrative related to each goal in a format differing from the other elements presented to the GPAC. He clarified that the version of the Draft Element being presented is redlined from Dudek's original revised draft.

He noted that the Existing Traffic Noise Contours map is referred to as Figure 1 but should be referred to as Figure N-1. He lamented that the Noise Study following the Housing Element has arbitrary traffic figures and follows an arbitrary list of streets, leading to an insufficiently comprehensive analysis. He added that the map labeled Figure 2 should be labeled Figure N-2, adding that the title of General Plan Housing Element Buildout Traffic Noise Contours needs clarity through its use of the abbreviation GPHE. He stated that the Airport Noise Contours map requires a better explanation, stating how it is a 2014 projection of expected 2030 airport noise and not a snapshot of how the noise looked in 2014. He stated that the 2024 Airport Noise Contours should be included in the Element, updated to the 2025 edition by the time the General Plan is approved in 2026.

In response to GPAC Member Baker's inquiries, Consultant Dickson confirmed that Dudek did noise modeling to verify the data shown in the maps. She added that she would have to ask their acoustician about places where the similar-looking maps differ. She confirmed that "GPHE" on Figure 2 is an abbreviation for General Plan Housing Element. She stated that the phrase "sensitive receptors" refers to areas where people who may be sensitive to loud noises would be for long periods of time, citing day care centers and schools as examples. She noted that the same person would be more likely to be considered a sensitive receptor at home, where they sleep, than in their office. She added that children are considered more sensitive than adults.

In response to GPAC Member Nicholas Acevedo's inquiry, Consultant Dickson clarified that "receiving use" refers to something receiving noise as opposed to emitting noise. She added that a sensitive receptor would be a receiving use.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that, in addition to retitling it Figure N-2, the label should be updated on Figure 2 because "GPHE" is confusing. Consultant Dickson agreed.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that Table N2, referring to Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) with corresponding Land Use Categories, should include a notation that it refers to exterior noise levels. He expressed his disappointment in Table N3's confusing labeling and lack of a companion table identifying the differences between non-transportation noise standards in the General Plan and the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC). He called to restore the table from prior Noise Elements not included in this draft.

GPAC Member Anthony Maniscalchi clarified that the Subcommittee does not want to have anything in the General Plan contradict anything in the NBMC. He added that, as it relates to anything covered in the NBMC, the General Plan should yield to the NBMC as the guiding light.

GPAC Member Mosher cited Draft Policy No. N-1.1 and Draft Policy No. N-1.3 as examples where the standards mentioned refer to the omitted NBMC-centric table and not Table N3 as written. He recommended using the more simplistic language found in the current Noise Element's Policy No. N-1.8 because the wording got garbled when adapted for this draft, perhaps obscuring the Policy's intent, adding how often this Policy is cited in Environmental Impact Reports.

GPAC Member Maniscalchi reported that the Subcommittee had a spirited debate over the confusing phrasing of Draft Policy No. N-1.8 in terms of which neighbor would be responsible for noise mitigation between an existing development and a new one.

GPAC Member Mosher clarified that Draft Policy No. N-1.9 should pluralize "ordinances" because noise ordinances are found in multiple parts of the NBMC.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that the paragraphs about aviation ahead of Goal N-2 should be shifted to the text ahead of Goal N-3 because Goal N-2 does not cover aviation. He reported that Draft Policy No. N-3.1 is identical to the second part of Draft Policy No. N-1.5A and does not need to be repeated. He called to restore the removed policy about keeping the Airport Noise Contours up to date by making it Draft Policy No. N-3.1 instead.

Planning Manager Zdeba noted that updating the Airport Noise Contours is covered in Draft Policy No. N-3.11.

In response to Nancy Gardner's inquiry, GPAC Member Mosher agreed with her concerns about why Draft Policy No. N-2.5's monitoring of boats falls to the Newport Beach Police Department (NBPd) and not another organization. He added that GPAC Member Paul Watkins had recommended the Orange County Sheriff's Department's Harbor Patrol. He suggested revising the Policy to recommend coordination between the NBPd, Harbor Department, and Harbor Patrol.

*GPAC Co-Chair Evans left the meeting, and GPAC Member Snider ran the remainder of the meeting.*

In response to GPAC Member Maniscalchi's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that policies related to the operation of John Wayne Airport, such as Draft Policy No. N-3.5 would remain as they are in the current Noise Element and be carried forward. He added that there were Subcommittee discussions about the Aviation Committee being a more appropriate body to discuss such policies in the future because they are related to the Settlement Agreement and other matters beyond the scope of the General Plan.

GPAC Member Mosher agreed that these matters are more under the purview of the Aviation Committee, lamenting that the ongoing reconstitution of the Committee makes it difficult to solicit feedback on airport-related noise policies.

GPAC Member Mosher noted that the draft policies under Goal N-4 also have an issue with the reliance on Table N3 and the omission of the current NBMC-based table. He added that Goal N-5 is almost entirely new, focusing on noise impacts from construction activities. He noted that they have been added since the version of the draft distributed with the meeting's announcement and Agenda packet. He echoed the concerns

expressed by GPAC Member Watkins at previous meetings about how the inclusion of the word “consider” waters down the policies and makes them ineffective.

GPAC Member Mosher reported on a best practices list for construction activities from the City of Long Beach’s General Plan and recommended including it in Newport Beach’s General Plan with mandatory adherence.

GPAC Member Maniscalchi stated that construction noise is generally temporary and the City shouldn’t impose the list on contractors.

GPAC Member Mosher noted that Long Beach only calls for the City to “encourage” the use of these best practices. He added that Newport Beach can also follow Long Beach through improved communication via a website informing the public and contractors about civic noise goals and violations.

GPAC Member Maniscalchi noted that there is a difference between long-term construction components and a contractor dropping off materials for short-term use. He expressed uncertainty over whether the Subcommittee agreed to make the list mandatory.

Planning Manager Zdeba noted that they can soften the language, adding that it would be up to the City Council to implement stringent limitations on vibrations and noise.

In response to Ms. Gardner’s inquiry, GPAC Member Mosher confirmed that he will ask for a vote on these matters.

GPAC Member Mosher agreed that the best practices should be encouraged in the Noise Element but not required.

In response to GPAC Member Christy Walker’s inquiries, GPAC Member Mosher agreed that construction vibrations may vary across the city based on how solid the ground is at any given section of Newport Beach. He added that the standard vibration level could have a different impact upon a home depending on its age and construction type, but it would be on the City Council to address area-specific nuances in the NBMC. He confirmed that the best practices list can be adjusted based on the type of building impacted by vibrations.

GPAC Member Watkins stated that the Draft Noise Element is well-done, but noted the lingering concerns of GPAC Members Maniscalchi and Mosher. He expressed concerns about whether the GPAC can arrive at an affirmative vote with so many outstanding nuanced concerns. He lauded the comments but lamented that there may need to be more discussions first between the Subcommittee, Dudek, and Planning Manager Zdeba.

GPAC Member Maniscalchi stated that the GPAC has multiple subcommittees that other members trust to do their job and agree to the results as draft elements are presented. He reported that the Noise Subcommittee had multiple internal debates and compromises to reach the draft’s current version. He stated that GPAC Member Mosher is merely looking for clarification on several items and no fundamental changes.

Planning Manager Zdeba agreed that nothing discussed in the meeting was an alarming change of the scope, but rather a refinement for clarity. He added that the General Plan will have a glossary to define terminology such as “sensitive receivers.” He stated that

GPAC Member Mosher is calling to clean up items that he does not find concerning in terms of moving the draft forward. He noted that there has been GPAC direction on multiple elements to make changes before they are heard by the General Plan Update Steering Committee (GPUSC), with redlined updates of edits made in the interim. He added that another option would be to approve the Draft Element, but also return it to the Noise Subcommittee to make those changes before it goes to the GPUSC. He commended the Subcommittee's work in refreshing the Element, adding that it will give the City an impetus to perform a long-overdue update to its noise ordinance.

Ms. Gardner stated that they need to get the Draft Noise Element moving along, calling for direct feedback on any policies GPAC members either disagree with or feel are missing. She reported that the Noise Subcommittee meetings were intensive and full of compromise. She echoed Planning Manager Zdeba's comments that the GPAC has passed along other draft elements to the GPUSC, knowing that they are not quite perfect at the time.

Chuck Fancher, resident, noted that other elements have had aspirational statements inserted, citing as an example the GPAC's call to monitor future developments in alternative fuels over the life of the General Plan. He stated that the future development of electric aircraft could similarly fit into the aircraft operations section of the Draft Noise Element.

GPAC Member Maniscalchi clarified that the Subcommittee focused on potentially regulating noise and not regulating technology.

GPAC Member David Guder stated that other cities will break up maps like those included in the Draft Noise Element into sections of a few square miles to make them more readable than what is presented in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

In response to GPAC Member Debbie Stevens' inquiry, Consultant Dickson confirmed that she will discuss Table N3 with Planning Manager Zdeba because part of potentially removing it depends on how City staff uses it in practice. She added that if it were removed, all policies referencing Table N3 would be rewritten to reference the NBMC. Planning Manager Zdeba noted that GPAC Member Mosher also suggested replacing it with a table from the California Building Code, adding that this could be considered among multiple other potential remedies. He reported that a good faith effort was made to clean up Table N3 and make it more usable, but at some point, they must trust the recommendations of a professional acoustician. He noted that consideration needs to be given to how a table in the NBMC is more easily adjustable than one in the General Plan.

In response to GPAC Member Guder's inquiry, Consultant Dickson confirmed that some documents are not included in the Draft Noise Element. Planning Manager Zdeba confirmed that the General Plan will have a technical appendix to document the methodology surrounding how noise was measured. He agreed that adjusting the Citywide maps to smaller sections would be beneficial, adding that staff is looking into having a dynamic map available online where a resident could zoom in to their home on the Noise Contours.

GPAC Member Guder recommended having at least a footnote about the City's recent Noise Study available on the General Plan website once completed.



**Motion** made by GPAC Member James Carlson and seconded by GPAC Member Curtis Black to forward the Draft Noise Element and Additional Policies to the General Plan Update Steering Committee for review, and for public review thereafter.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**c. Updates and Overview of Upcoming Deliverables, Objectives**

City staff and the consultant team will provide updates since the GPAC last convened on September 16, 2025, and what to expect from here in terms of deliverables and timing.

*Recommended Actions:*

- (1) Receive a presentation from City staff and the consultant team; and
- (2) Provide any feedback on the efforts.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported that the City conducted a pair of open houses to obtain public feedback on the drafts, leading to 67 unique comments. He noted that the virtual open house's archived video has received good viewership on the City's YouTube page and reported on other successful public outreach figures over the past two months, including increased traffic on the City's General Plan update website.

GPAC Member Stevens commended the materials distributed at the open houses by Dudek and City staff, but lamented that more people should have attended.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported on the next steps for the GPAC leading up to an anticipated City Council adoption in April or May of 2026. He noted that a refreshed Draft Implementation Plan will be sent to the members on November 12<sup>th</sup>, and a joint meeting of the GPAC and GPUSC will be held on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. He added that there is a goal to have a GPAC meeting in mid-January of 2026 to consider a final draft. He added that the draft elements have been presented to the relevant City boards, commissions, and committees for feedback, with several of them already providing their thoughts.

In response to GPAC Member Black's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that there will be a need for agility on subcommittees potentially meeting between the receipt of the public feedback report on November 18<sup>th</sup> and the December 3<sup>rd</sup> GPAC meeting, depending on the depth of comments received. He stated that he would work with each subcommittee chair to address the needs for such a meeting.

In response to GPAC Member Mosher's inquiries, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that the existing conditions and background analysis reports are a snapshot in time based on when they were prepared, and it was not envisioned that they would be updated. He added that boards, commissions, and committees have been cautioned to flag anything in those reports that they find to be grossly inaccurate, reporting that none of them have gone to this level of detail. He confirmed that they would be posted with the final product. Consultant Dickson confirmed that the reports can be updated if an inaccuracy impacts a policy. Planning Manager Zdeba reported that the City Arts Commission identified an aspect of the report that had been amended by the City Council after the report's production, adding that the change did not impact a General Plan policy.

V. **COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

GPAC Member Goldberg requested the presentation of an elevated bicycle lane to the City Council due to eBike safety concerns. She added that Orange County provides funding for such projects.

Ms. Gardner reported that there is a working committee presenting new policies to the City Council, and that is where the focus should be.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported that eBike regulations were on last night's City Council Agenda and encouraged her to watch the video of the meeting.

In response to Planning Manager Zdeba's inquiry, the GPAC members agreed that 4:00 p.m. is a good starting time for their meetings.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, GPAC Member Snider adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m.

*Next Meeting: December 3, 2025 at 4 p.m.*




**CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

100 Civic Center Drive  
Newport Beach, California 92660

949 644-3200  
[newportbeachca.gov/communitydevelopment](http://newportbeachca.gov/communitydevelopment)

## Memorandum

**To:** Chair Gardner and GPUSC Members, and Co-Chairs Evans and Greer and GPAC Members

**From:** Benjamin M. Zdeba, AICP, Planning Manager 

**Date:** November 24, 2025

**Re:** Agenda Item IV(b) – Attachments 2a, 2b, and 2c, Input from the Community Members and City Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Between August and October 2025, various draft Elements of the General Plan Update were on fourteen City Board, Commission, and Committee agendas for introduction, ad hoc committee formation, and feedback. This effort is summarized in Table 1 below.

*Table 1, General Plan Update at City Boards, Commissions, and Committees*

City BCC	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3
City Arts Commission	9/11/25, Introduction	10/9/25, Ad Hoc Formation	11/13/25, Comments
Board of Library Trustees	8/18/25, Introduction	10/20/25, No Comments	
Harbor Commission	8/13/25, Introduction	11/12/25, Comments	
Parks, Beaches & Recreation Commission	8/5/25, Introduction	9/2/25, Ad Hoc Formation	10/7/25, Comments
Planning Commission	10/9/25, Introduction	11/20/25, Comments	
Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee	9/4/25, Introduction/ Ad Hoc Formation	10/2/25, Comments	

Concurrently, we publicized the release of seven draft Elements for the community to review and provide input with a requested deadline for comments by November 17, 2025.

City staff has compiled and reviewed all input received from community members (Attachment 2a) and City Boards, Commissions, and Committees (Attachment 2b) on the draft Elements. Each Subcommittee has received its respective comments for consideration and will bring up any comments as appropriate for GPAC and GPUSC discussion. City staff has provided recommended responses to each comment received for consideration. In addition, Attachment 2c includes two comments that were sent to the Planning Commission and City Council.

INTENTIONALLY BLANK PAGE